

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/939,514	08/24/2001	Jonathan L. Sessler	045404.0003	3535
20790 75	590 09/09/2003		•	
AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD, L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
300 WEST 6TF SUITE 2100	00 WEST 6TH STREET UITE 2100		GERSTL, ROBERT	
AUSTIN, TX 78701			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			DATE MAILED: 09/09/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/939,514	SESSLER ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert Gerstl	1626
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 31 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application and indication of the application	ation. A proper reply to a
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5.☑ The a)☑ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	☐ will be entered and an w or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>4.9,11,32,39,45,49 and 51</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 37,40-43 an	nd 47.	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 	roved b∜ the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen		
10. ☐ Other:	(e)(
		Robert Gerstl Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1626

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it raises issues of inventorship by paragraph 4 which allows for onlya single inventor by the use of /or. clarification is required.